DRAFT

The United Kingdom and the Future of Nuclear Weapons

Andrew Futter

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD
Lanham • Boulder • New York • London

DRAFT

Published by Rowman & Littlefield
A wholly owned subsidiary of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

Unit A, Whitacre Mews, 26-34 Stannary Street, London SE11 4AB

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Christie, Jane L. (THIS IS A PLACEHOLDER. CIP DATA TO COME)
Title: Negotiating gendered discourses : Michelle Bachelet and Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner / Jane L. Christie.
Description: Lanham : Lexington Books, 2015. | Series: Latin American gender and sexualities | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2015034023| ISBN 9781498512343 (cloth : alkaline paper) | ISBN 9781498512350 (electronic)
Subjects: LCSH: Bachelet, Michelle, 1951- | Fernandez de Kirchner, Cristina. | Women presidents--Chile--Biography. | Women presidents--Argentina--Biography. | Women--Political activity--Chile. | Women--Political activity--Argentina. | Human rights--Chile. | Human rights--Argentina. | Chile--Politics and government--1988- | Argentina--Politics and government--2002-
Classification: LCC F3101.4.B33 C47 2015 | DDC 320.0820983--dc23 LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2015034023

∞™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

DRAFT

This space is reserved for a dedication or epigraph

DRAFT

DRAFT

Table of Contents

Foreword ix

Introduction: The Trident Debate Renewed xiii
Andrew Futter

I: British Nuclear Strategy: History and Culture

1 Seventy Years of British Nuclear Debates : A Short Overview 1
Daniel Salisbury

2 The United Kingdom's Nuclear Deterrent : A System of Systems 17
David Jarvis

3 UK Trident Renewal : Antecedents and Decision Making 29
Kristan Stoddart

4 The Silence of British Nuclear Culture 45
Jonathan Hogg

II: Trident Renewal: The Wider Context

5 The Heterogeneity of UK Military Views on Nuclear Weapons 59
Henrietta Wilson

6 The Trident Renewal Decision, the United Kingdom, and the NPT 73
Lukasz Kulesa and Shatabhisha Shetty

7 Reflections on the Legality and Legitimacy of Trident Renewal 91
William Walker

8 Surviving a Sea Change : Trident and the Special Relationship 105
Heather Williams

9 Dangerous and Inhumane : UK Nuclear Policy and Humanitarian Nuclear Ban Strategies 119
Rebecca Johnson

10 "Bairns Not Bombs" : The Scottish Peace Movement and the UK Nuclear State 137
Catherine Eschle

III: Next Steps and Future Challenges

11 Sustaining Trident : Nuclear Absolutism and Nuclear Symbolism 153
Nick Ritchie

12 Next Steps in the United Kingdom's Nuclear Warhead Programme : What Future for the Atomic Weapons Establishment? 173
Peter Burt

13 The Future of Political Opposition to Trident 189
Toby Fenwick

14 Future UK Nuclear Deterrence Requirements 205
Andrew Futter

Index 219

About the Contributors 221

DRAFT

Chapter Eleven

Sustaining Trident

Nuclear Absolutism and Nuclear Symbolism

Nick Ritchie

[11.0] Nuclear weapons exist in a unique discursive realm. Their value rests on an abstract logic of nuclear deterrence that can be neither proven nor disproven. Numerous security logics, identities, and outcomes can be discursively assigned to these weapons and can, over time, constitute deeply embedded "regimes of nuclear truth".[1] These regimes channel and circumscribe how and what we think about nuclear weapons. In Britain, the continued deployment of nuclear weapons is justified as essential to the nation's security. The United Kingdom must invest in another generation of strategic nuclear weaponry to protect the state and its people, so the narrative goes. The formal script from Whitehall propagated by the mainstream press is one of "nuclear absolutism": nuclear deterrence works, nuclear weapons are essential to UK security now and for the foreseeable future, nuclear weapons are part of who we are, nuclear weapons are safe and benign, and any consideration of relinquishing them is totally irresponsible.[2] Absolutism is a marketing necessity when it comes to nuclear weapons given their extreme destructive capacity, the exceptionalism of their possession and potential use after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the inherent challenges of justifying a system of indiscriminate nuclear violence in a democracy—what Daniel Deudney calls "nuclear despotism".[3]

[11.1] Nuclear weapons are not developed and deployed easily or on a whim. They are the product of executive decision making and the assembly of a large coalition or "actor-networks" to produce, manage, and deploy the United Kingdom's nuclear warheads and ballistic missile submarines. Recruiting and sustaining the necessary organisations, technologies, industries, ideas, narratives, and institutionalised understandings into a nuclear actor-network

is a major national undertaking.[4] It entails substantial resources, ideological commitments, and the potential for massive nuclear violence that must be publicly justified, and "nuclear absolutism" is the means. It is a narrative deployed to convince doubters and waverers to continue to base UK security on a blunt instrument of terrible violence. It is a "conventional wisdom" that masks contingencies, risks, and realities in the name of national security and reproduces a particular form of British militarism. The political imperatives for nuclear absolutism in the United Kingdom are perhaps stronger than elsewhere given the persistent public debate on retaining or relinquishing nuclear weapons. Framing nuclear weapons as absolutely essential for the security of the state and society and articulating an expansive set of values and roles for UK nuclear weapons forecloses a more nuanced and realistic appraisal. A nuanced assessment that foregrounds the many contingencies and risks associated with nuclear weapons could potentially tip the political and public balance in favour of their abandonment. Whitehall's nuclear stalwarts do not want that.

This chapter outlines and challenges the nuclear absolutism of government narratives that seek to justify the United Kingdom's continued deployment of nuclear weapons well into the twenty-first century. It argues that everything about nuclear weapons is contingent and contested and that a clear understanding of these contingencies is an essential part of debate. It then highlights the power of nuclear symbolism in shaping how we think and act in relation to Russia and Putinism after the annexation of Crimea. It does so by challenging the seductive response of matching Russia nuclear revaluation with our own and NATO's in the context of an evolving and complex relationship between Russia and Europe. The chapter aims to go beyond binary platitudes that say Trident is either worth nothing or worth everything to "national security". It seeks to question what we think nuclear weapons provide us as a national community, how nuclear weapons condition our conceptions of security, and whether we should change what and how we think about them. Without critical questioning, the electorate risks supporting a hugely expensive and controversial programme on a false security prospectus based on nuclear absolutism and nuclear symbolism. [11.2]

IDEALISTIC NUCLEAR CERTAINTY [11.3]

Government and their supporters justify British nuclear weapons because they are seen to provide essential and legitimate security benefits to the United Kingdom. They are essential because of the risk of future nuclear threats that can only be deterred through a counterthreat of nuclear retaliation. They are deemed legitimate because the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty recognises the United Kingdom as a Nuclear Weapon State and [11.4]

because the United Kingdom considers itself a "force for good" in the world eager to pull its weight in reproducing a particular global security order. We saw this most recently in Chancellor George Osborne's proclamation in New York that "Britain has got its mojo back" and is "reasserting itself on the world stage" following the vote in the House of Commons to join the bombing campaign in Syria against ISIS.[5]

[11.5] British nuclear weapons are justified as an *essential* component of UK national security: we cannot and must not live without the capacity to threaten massive nuclear violence against other states and societies. These weapons are essential because we cannot know the future and therefore we cannot rule out a scenario in which the United Kingdom's own nuclear threat provides existential salvation by successfully deterring an adversary from launching a nuclear attack against it. Because we can *imagine* such a scenario, then we had better keep nuclear weapons just in case. As the Labour government's 2006 White Paper put it, the inability to "accurately predict the global security environment over the next 20 to 50 years" means any form of nuclear or broad strategic military threat cannot be ruled out.[6]

[11.6] This is framed as an "insurance policy" that ensures protection of the state from nuclear attack. In fact, the theme of "future uncertainty" and retention of a nuclear capability as an essential "insurance" against strategic risk has defined government narratives on replacing the current Trident system.[7] Blair was quite clear in the foreword to the 2006 report that

[11.7] > we believe that an independent British nuclear deterrent is an essential part of our insurance against the uncertainties and risks of the future [and that] an independent deterrent ensures our vital interests will be safeguarded.[8]

[11.8] The report insisted that we must retain our nuclear weapons just in case because we cannot "predict the nature of any future threats to our vital interests over the extended timescales associated with decisions about the renewal of our nuclear deterrent".[9] Necessity and insurance in the face of uncertainty is the justificatory theme. Prime Minister David Cameron, who has repeatedly asserted that UK nuclear weapons are "the ultimate insurance policy against blackmail or attack by other countries, adopted this mantra. "That is why I believe it is right to maintain and replace it".[10] His favoured Trident sound bite is "Trident is the ultimate insurance policy, in an unsafe and uncertain world, that we can never be subject to nuclear blackmail".[11] Britain must keep its nuclear weapons as an "insurance" or a guarantee of protection against future strategic threats to its "vital interests" in an uncertain and complex international security environment in which nuclear weapons may continue to proliferate.[12]

[11.9] This paints a picture of UK nuclear weapons as providing assured, necessary, responsible, and benign protection through the practice of nuclear deter-

rence. Nuclear deterrence is portrayed as a certainty in an uncertain world. Nuclear weapons successfully deterred the Soviet Union during the Cold War, and they will unproblematically deter other adversaries for as long as necessary, including a revanchist Russia (see chapter 14).[13]

REALISTIC NUCLEAR UNCERTAINTY [11.10]

Nuclear weapons are not a form of insurance or a guarantee or protection. [11.11] The practice of nuclear deterrence is not a science but a set of military, political, and cultural interactions involving bureaucratic-military systems capable of inflicting supreme violence. There are fundamental uncertainties associated with the theory and practice of nuclear deterrence. These challenge and undermine its "system of logic, conceptualisation and bureaucratic truth".[14]

Proponents of nuclear deterrence argue that it prevented another major [11.12] industrialised war after the horrors of World War II. It is the massive, immediate, and incontestable destruction of a nuclear war that induces caution into interstate relations in times of crisis.[15] A UK nuclear deterrent threat could, of course, be decisive in future nuclear crises by inducing precisely this sort of caution and restraint. That cannot be ruled out or in anyway disproven. But it is *not* an automatic outcome of the deployment of nuclear weapons. The success of nuclear deterrent threats is not a foregone conclusion but is heavily context specific. It is based on the perceived credibility of the threat, the political will to use nuclear violence given perceived interests at stake, the ability to convincingly communicate the will to act to an aggressor, an accurate understanding of how a particular aggressor can be most effectively deterred, and a decision by an aggressor to be deterred.[16] This is further complicated by the increasing complexity of nuclear deterrence. If successful deterrence requires some understanding of an adversary's motivation, worldview, resolve, and cost-benefit calculus, then successful deterrence is becoming more difficult as the type of actors, capabilities, cultures, contexts, and intentions evolves and expands.[17] Total confidence in the efficacy of a nuclear deterrent threat is becoming increasingly idealistic.[18]

An assumption of uniform rationality leading to caution and stability in [11.13] strategic relations requires what James Lebovic describes as "heroic assumptions about the adversary—its ability to think dispassionately, process information, and make the 'right' decision under the most challenging of conditions".[19] This can lead to misunderstandings, miscalculation, or determined resistance to deterrent threats.[20] The Cold War nuclear confrontation was not the stable, predictable relationship of assured destruction it is often portrayed as today. It was highly dangerous, plagued by uncertainty, and fuelled by worst-case assumptions and planning with very serious risks of a deliberate

or inadvertent cataclysmic nuclear exchange.[21] General Lee Butler, former head of America's Strategic Command, stated in 1998:

[11.14]

> While we clung to the notion that nuclear war could be reliably deterred, Soviet leaders derived from their historical experience the conviction that such a war might be thrust upon them and if so, must not be lost. Driven by that fear, they took Herculean measures to fight and survive no matter the odds or the costs. Deterrence was a dialogue of the blind with the deaf.[22]

[11.15] In short, there is no guarantee that nuclear deterrence will work under the intense conditions of escalating conflict. Nuclear weapons do not offer "insurance" against attack, and false confidence that they will automatically deter could lead a country into very dangerous territory.

[11.16] The conventional wisdom that "nuclear deterrence works" because it did in the Cold War must therefore be challenged. This is not to argue that nuclear weapons had zero effect on Cold War politics. The intellectual, organisational, and material machinery of nuclear weapons dominated, indeed defined, the Cold War security paradigm. The presence of vast stockpiles of nuclear weapons and command-and-control systems ready to progress to a central apocalyptic nuclear exchange cannot but have sharpened the minds of policymakers. Nevertheless, the "nuclearisation" of the Cold War in the late 1940s and early 1950s and the massive expansion of nuclear arsenals that followed does not provide an exclusive, singular explanation for the absence of direct military conflict between East and West. The "certainty" that nuclear deterrent threats prevented the Cold War turning hot and will continue to prevent war between the major powers is contestable.[23] It is founded on the assumption that absent such threats the major powers would have "allowed their various crises to escalate if all they had to fear at the end of the escalatory ladder was something like a repetition of World War II," as John Mueller argues.[24] Powerful arguments can be made that the sheer scale of destruction that accompanied World War II through conventional weaponry was sufficient to deter future global war between the major industrialised powers.[25] In fact, Ambassador George Kennan, who in 1946 first articulated the doctrine of long-term military and political containment of the Soviet Union as part of a new Cold War, concluded in 1984 that the Soviet Union had no interest in overrunning Western Europe militarily and that it would not have launched an attack on Europe in the decades after World War II even if nuclear weapons did not exist.[26]

[11.17] Furthermore, the historical track record of nuclear deterrent threats is mixed at best: nuclear coercion, or "blackmail," has rarely worked in practice. A detailed 2013 study on nuclear blackmail concluded, "despite their extraordinary power, nuclear weapons are uniquely poor instruments of compellance".[27] Jacek Kugler's study in the mid-1980s of major crises involving

nuclear powers concluded that nuclear weapons did not "directly affect the outcomes of extreme crises or deter conflicts" with nuclear or non-nuclear nations or provide an obvious advantage.[28] History also demonstrates that the possession of nuclear weapons does *not* prevent regional aggression against the interests of nuclear weapon states. The Soviet Union, for example, established control over Eastern Europe during the period of US nuclear monopoly, North Korea invaded US-backed South Korea in 1950, North Vietnam fought a nuclear-armed China and United States, Argentina invaded the Falklands/Malvinas in 1982, and Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990 and launched Scud missiles against nuclear-armed Israel.[29] The late Robin Cook, MP, also suggested,

> It is not easy to see what practical return Britain ever got out of the extravagant sums we invested in our nuclear systems. None of our wars was ever won by them and none of the enemies we fought was deterred by them. General Galtieri was not deterred from seizing the Falklands, although Britain possessed the nuclear bomb and Argentina did not.[30] **[11.18]**

At root is the extreme difficulty of linking the use of nuclear weapons to any rational system of political means and ends—and the use of nuclear weapons cannot be divorced from their deployment. The logic of nuclear deterrence rests on detailed, permanent, and active plans, operational capabilities, organisational infrastructure, and political will to fire nuclear warheads at other countries (what Nash called the "bureaucratisation of homicide"[31]). Anthony Burke has eloquently argued that the sheer destructiveness of nuclear weapons conflates ostensibly rational practices of nuclear threat making with deeply emotional dread and raw fear that can generate intended and unintended outcomes.[32] As Alex Wellerstein puts it, "The method of persuasion is threatening to burn everybody alive".[33] Nevertheless, as Burke argues, a powerful "belief in the utility of nuclear weapons, and in the ability to develop rational and controllable strategies for their use in deterrence and war" was and remains widespread: "a conviction in the rationality of nuclear weapons as instruments of the state". This Cold War nuclear rationalism obscured the idea that deterrent threats could have the reverse effect of galvanising resistance for reasons of national pride, domestic politics, or international status.[34] This led MccGwire and others to argue the "self-sustaining complex of assumptions, beliefs and 'truths'" about nuclear deterrence was part of the security problem, not the solution.[35] **[11.19]**

UNSTABLE NUCLEAR RISK **[11.20]**

The messy reality of global nuclear politics undermines the comforting story that nuclear deterrence automatically stabilises crises between nuclear-armed **[11.21]**

opponents, prevents aggression against nuclear-armed states' vital interests, or are useful instruments for compellance or crisis management. In fact, the reverse can apply. The practice of nuclear deterrence has the potential to foster violent conflict as well as the potential to deter it. In 2015 Michael Krepon asked, "Can deterrence ever be stable"? He argued that deterrence stability is a mirage, that nuclear weapons do not create stability and security but incentivise risk taking and intensify crises. A number of studies have explored nuclear near misses where the risk of the collapse of conflict into nuclear violence was worryingly high, not least the Cuban Missile Crisis.[36] There have been incidents where misperception and paranoia could have pushed humanity over the nuclear brink, such as the Able Archer crisis in 1983. There have been episodes in which the idea that the presence of nuclear weapons makes it somehow "safe" to engage in shooting wars because nuclear deterrence would prevent escalation has been severely tested, such as the India-Pakistan Kargil confrontation in 1999.[37]

[11.22] Advocates of nuclear deterrence point to the fact that nuclear weapons have not be used intentionally or by accident since Nagasaki, therefore the risk of deterrence failing or nuclear weapon systems going badly wrong is exaggerated. A 2013 study by economist Carl Lundgren in *The Nonproliferation Review* dismantles this type of nuclear optimism. Lundgren provides a Bayesian statistical analysis of the probability of nuclear war arising from three broad scenarios: an international crisis leading directly to nuclear war; an accident or misperception leading to nuclear use; and an escalation of a conventional war to nuclear use. The Bayesian methodology enables statisticians to generate valid probabilities "where only limited data are available and assured knowledge is not possible, but important conclusions or inferences must still be drawn in order to make choices or set policy".[38] Lundgren's analysis calculates that the "posterior combined risk of nuclear war during the Cold War [the best estimate after evidence of nuclear crises and mishaps is observed] was 44.3 per cent" and that "the first sixty-six years of the nuclear age produced a 61 per cent chance of a nuclear war".[39] He states that this is equivalent to a 2.1 percent chance per year, or an average frequency of one nuclear war every forty-seven years. Lundgren highlights research conducted in the 1980s by political scientist Michael Wallace, mathematician Linn Sennot, and computer scientist Brian Crissey on the probability of nuclear war using data from 1978 to 1983 on US false alarms. They arrive at the conclusion that "there is an almost 50% chance of a war-threatening false alarm of some type occurring during severe length crisis", defined as a thirty-day crisis comparable to the Cuban Missile Crisis.[40] Lundgren concludes:

[11.23]

> Fighting the Cold War with nuclear armaments and nuclear threats was a perilous wager. The probability of a failure resulting in nuclear war exceeded

> the probability of making an incorrect call while flipping a coin. The world must find a way to unwind this desperate gamble.[41]

[11.24] The point, here, is to highlight the contingency of nuclear deterrence and to challenge the narrative that insists nuclear weapons bring certainty, "insurance", a guarantee of protection, a common understanding amongst all nuclear-armed adversaries at all times, and a rational logic of crisis escalation and control through the supposedly infallible practice of nuclear deterrence. On the contrary, nuclear deterrence involves relational interaction between complexes of people, political cultures, organisations, bureaucratic practices, and military technologies and systems.

[11.25] The inherent fallibility of nuclear deterrence and the consequences of its failure by accident or design constitute a considerable societal risk. This is of paramount concern because even if the probability of something going wrong with the technology, organisational procedures, or the practice of nuclear deterrence in a crisis is considered small, the consequences from the deliberate or accidental detonation of even a single nuclear weapon would likely be catastrophic. Recent evidence suggests that even a relatively modest nuclear exchange would have devastating effects on the global environment.[42] Supporters of nuclear weapons argue that we need not concern ourselves with the actual use of nuclear weapons because they are designed as "political" weapons never to be used. Their effect is in the deterrence of aggression. That may be the intent but, as noted above, the effectiveness of a nuclear threat requires a credible system for use in a crisis. Nuclear deterrence only has to fail once for a humanitarian catastrophe to ensue. This nuclear gamble as been steadily "normalised" by some as safe, secure, and benign; it is anything but.

[11.26] So what could UK nuclear weapons do? The reality is that UK nuclear deterrent threats only have potential relevance to an extremely narrow set of scenarios.[43] Successive governments' specific argument is that we need nuclear weapons because at some point in the future another nuclear-armed country such as Russia *might* seriously threaten the United Kingdom or its allies with a *nuclear or massive conventional attack* that could threaten to bomb this country or its allies past the point of recovery. In such a scenario, an independent UK threat to retaliate with strategic nuclear weapons *might* cause the belligerent to think twice. We might *never* face such a scenario, but if we do our possession of nuclear weapons *might not* prevent disaster and *could* equally hasten calamity.

[11.27] The strategic case for retaining nuclear weapons remains very thin. The United Kingdom does not face an existential military threat to the survival of the state and hasn't done so for about a quarter of a century since the end of the Cold War (a third of the time the United Kingdom has been nuclear armed). As Nick Witney, former director-general of International Security Policy at MoD, noted in 1995,

[11.28] A continuing role for nuclear deterrence, however, is not the same thing as a continuing role for a specifically British nuclear deterrence; and whereas the general rationale may have survived the end of the Cold War, perhaps weakened but still sustainable, the specifically British one clearly has not.[44]

[11.29] NUCLEAR SYMBOLISM AND RESPONDING TO RUSSIA

[11.30] The uncertainty and instability of nuclear deterrent threats necessitates careful thinking about the relationship between UK nuclear weapons and Russia in the context of the current Ukraine crisis. The fundamental question is whether UK nuclear weapons enhance or undermine UK and wider NATO security. Both positions are ultimately unprovable, but this section outlines a case for reducing the role of nuclear weapons in the current crisis, including UK nuclear weapons, based on the very serious long-term risks involved in embedding a deeply hostile and overtly nuclearized relationship between Moscow and Europe.

[11.31] The specific security case for a UK nuclear capability has long rested on Russia. This has been the case since the end of the Cold War but has taken on new significance following the annexation of Crimea in 2014.[45] This was a clear violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity and a breach of international law. It has led to civil war in Ukraine's south and east with disastrous humanitarian and wider economic effect and exacerbated insecurity in countries bordering Russia, particular the former Soviet republics.

[11.32] The crisis in Ukraine centred on corruption, cronyism, electoral fraud, and human aspirations. This set of issues has largely faded from view in the United Kingdom. It has been replaced by a narrative that understands the crisis as symptomatic of geopolitical rivalry between Russia and the West with Ukraine as a proxy. The broader context is the deterioration of Russia-US/NATO relations from the mid 2000s. Russia-US/NATO relations reached new highs following the 9/11 attacks and the emergence of a common enemy in Al Qaeda. By the mid 2000s the relationship was deteriorating significantly, culminating a post–Cold War low with the Russo-Georgia war in August 2008. This deterioration centred on the further expansion of NATO in 2004, Russian interpretations of the "colour revolutions" in Georgia in 2003, Ukraine in 2004 to 2005, and Kyrgyzstan in 2005 as part of a Western-conceived conspiracy to drastically reduce Russia's influence and, at worst, "a dress rehearsal for installing a pro-U.S. liberal puppet regime in the Kremlin"[46], and deep concern at the brand of neoconservative unilateralism practiced by George W. Bush in his first term. This was captured in Vladimir Putin's speech to the Munich Security Conference in 2007:

[11.33] Today we are witnessing an almost uncontained hyper use of force—military force—in international relations, force that is plunging the world into an abyss

> of permanent conflicts. As a result, we do not have sufficient strength to find a comprehensive solution to any one of these conflicts. Finding a political settlement also becomes impossible. . . . One state and, of course, first and foremost the United States, has overstepped its national borders in every way. This is visible in the economic, political, cultural and educational policies it imposes on other nations. Well, who likes this? Who is happy about this?[47]

[11.34] The Obama-Medvedev post-Georgia "reset" failed to take hold, and Putin returned to the presidency determined to restore Russia's role as an independent great power in a "polycentric world". Russia's political and economic resurgence through the 2000s facilitated the Kremlin's resistance to integration on Western/US terms that was increasingly framed as Cold War geopolitical containment and capitalist encirclement.

[11.35] UK policy discourse after the annexation of Crimea has coalesced around themes of Western resistance to Russian chauvinism, traditional interstate military security, forging consensus within and political cohesion of the European "West", and economic punishment and military deterrence. It is a familiar narrative, fostered energetically by Moscow, which generates and reproduces enmity through a process of mutual "othering" in which both sides tend to paint the other as implacably hostile, duplicitous, and dangerous. This is part of an intensifying security dilemma in which steps taken to advance the security of NATO member states or prospective members are seen as threatening by Moscow, which takes political and military steps to counter NATO preparations, which reinforces worst-case analyses and prompts additional steps that cement hostility.[48]

[11.36] The problem is that "othering" processes inevitably narrow the set of options deemed legitimate and acceptable.[49] As the European Leadership Network observed in August 2015:

[11.37]

> Russia and NATO both seem to see the new deployments and increased focus on exercises as necessary corrections of their previous military posture. Each side is convinced that its actions are justified by the negative changes in their security environment. Second, an action-reaction cycle is now in play that will be difficult to stop.[50]

[11.38] This is reflected in a series of actions and responses by Russia and NATO from the expansion of NATO in 2004 to the present. Latest NATO measures include the outcomes of its summit in Wales in September 2014 (including the NATO Readiness Action Plan, the NATO Response Force, and its Very High Readiness Joint Task Force)[51], Western sanctions against Russia[52], and a review of nuclear strategy.[53] In fact, a number of commentators have argued for a more forceful response from NATO against what is seen as an implacable and dangerous enemy that will only respond to military counter-

threats and enhanced conventional and nuclear deployments and capabilities.[54]

[11.39] Russia has deliberately intensified its nuclear weapon operations and threats in crude attempts at deterrence and intimidation.[55] This has taken the form of a resumption of strategic bomber patrols beginning in 2007, increased nuclear-capable submarine activity, a significant increase in close military encounters between NATO, Swedish, and Finnish military forces and Russia[56], military exercises simulating a conventional nuclear attack on Poland as part of the Zapad 2009 exercise[57], extensive continental and regional nuclear exercises[58], major military exercises in Russia's Western Military District, insistence on the right to deploy nuclear weapons in Crimea[59], and nuclear threats to European allies, including Denmark in public[60] and the Baltic states in private (as reported via the "Elbe group" discussions of former senior US and Russian intelligence professionals[61]). They are crude because, as noted above, the historical record suggests nuclear blackmail and compellance do not work and because serious questions can be asked about their credibility.

[11.40] The crisis in Ukraine has been used by UK politicians to reinforce for the case for Trident replacement as a necessary response to international political uncertainty generated by Russia.[62] Defence Secretary Michael Fallon said in February 2015 that "Russian aggression is a direct threat to NATO", that Moscow had "lowered the threshold" for nuclear use after Crimea, and that "the main answer to that is to make sure that we modernise our own deterrent".[63] Policymakers and MPs have also argued that if Ukraine had retained its Soviet nuclear missiles and managed to develop an indigenous infrastructure to safely manage and maintain them then Russia would not have intervened.[64] This is a doubtful counterfactual given the interests at stake and Putin's deliberate if clumsy strategy of ambiguity, denial, and deception.[65]

[11.41] More broadly, however, the United Kingdom asserts a purely symbolic role for its nuclear weapons in the current confrontation through two narratives.[66] First, an Atlanticist narrative that says the United Kingdom must share, and be seen to share, "the burden" of the nuclear defence of NATO with Washington as the United States' closest military and political ally.[67] This narrative has become embedded because UK nuclear weapons are formally assigned to NATO under the 1962 Nassau Agreement that facilitated the 1963 Polaris Sales Agreement (later amended for Trident), and because the United Kingdom remains dependent on US patronage for continued operation of its Trident nuclear weapon system.[68] The narrative is often justified by claiming UK nuclear weapons provide "a second centre of decision-making" within the Alliance on the use of nuclear weapons and thereby "complicating" the decision making of an adversary.[69] Second, a narrative of nuclear exceptionalism frames the United Kingdom, US, and NATO conventional and nuclear capabilities as a collective "force for good" in defence of the

"West" and therefore global security. This narrative says Western nuclear weapons are good for international peace and security, but those in the hands of authoritarian states or states beyond the West's sphere of influence are illegitimate and undermine international order.[70] Continued Western possession of nuclear weapons is legitimised as an essential bulwark against nonliberal, nondemocratic, nuclear-armed states that might use their nuclear might to challenge and possibly overturn the Western international order.[71]

[11.42] Nevertheless, adducing Russian actions to support an enduring if largely symbolic case for a pseudo-independent British strategic nuclear capability on high alert assumes a lot. In worst cases Russian actions are symptomatic of a revanchist project to reconstruct a pro-Moscow buffer zone of compliant satellite states underpinned by a resurgent and expansionist bloc ideology of state capitalism and klepocratic authoritarianism. This does not appear to capture the centre of gravity of Moscow's foreign policy in the Georgian and Ukrainian confrontations and former President Dmitry Medvedev's assertion of "privileged interests" in its "near abroad" after the short war with Georgia in 2008. Rather, it seems symptomatic of a reflexive cultural recourse to a Cold War explanatory model to account for Russian actions, to categorise the Ukrainian crisis, to frame appropriate Western responses, and to revalidate the false certainties of security through nuclear deterrence.[72] It is through this lens that a geostrategic case for Trident is rationalised as an appropriate response to an enduring and potentially existential military threat to Europe and the Western liberal international order.

[11.43] What is required instead is a different reading of the United Kingdom and NATO security and the role of nuclear weapons in the current conflict over Ukraine and the broader adversarial context that has developed. This requires seeing the conflict and Moscow's "nuclear euphoria"[73] for what it is: symptomatic of a Russian narrative of victimhood, resistance, and resurgence and an almost hypermasculine foreign policy in which nuclear threats are deployed to try to sow political fear abroad and mobilise support at home for Putin's autocratic rule through displays of nuclear strength from a position of political, military, and economic weakness.

[11.44] Russian and European interests have increasingly diverged, underpinned by mutually antagonistic (or anxiety-generating) political ideologies that pitch European liberalism against Putin's growing authoritarianism. Nevertheless, the evidence does not seem to support a Cold War 2.0 model. Russian actions, whilst illegal, destabilising, and perilous for the parties involved, seem to reflect an increasingly militant resistance to the encroachment of "the West," its values and institutions. In that respect it is primarily defensive, from Moscow's perspective (though more preemptively so in Ukraine than Georgia). As Alexei Arbatov has argued, Moscow's "nuclear bravado" is a political message to the United States and NATO to refrain from a military intervention: "It is targeted at the West to impress upon its

leaders the exceptional importance of this region for Russia's national security interests".[74] It is rooted in a mutual mismanagement of postimperial Russia's insecurity after Yeltsin in terms of what sort of state it is and how it should act. It is an insecurity framed (rightly or wrongly) by a narrative of post–Cold War humiliation, containment, and attempted assimilation into a decadent Western hegemony. Righteous, nationalistic, and often xenophobic resistance facilitated by a resurgent if fragile extraction economy represents the reassertion of an autonomous Russian identity for the Putin clique.

[11.45] What is at stake, then, is the stable management of the EU/NATO relationship with post-Soviet Russia—a delicate and dynamic mix of engagement, integration, reassurance, inclusion, democratisation, and balancing. This requires acknowledging that the European-Russian relationship is "too big too fail" and that an exclusionary overt "containment" and militarised ideological confrontation is to be avoided given the foreseeable mutual long-term pain and high risk for all involved. This is not to deny Russian threats, to "appease", or to encourage Russian adventurism, but to be clear that careful management of European-Russia relations is essential, that common interests require cooperation, that Putinism is likely to characterise Russian politics for some time, that the West's capacity to contain and deter has diluted as power has spread in the international system, but that Europe and the West are nonetheless operating from a position of considerable strength compared to Moscow.

[11.46] Here, it is vital to acknowledge agency: we in the "West" have national and collective *choice* in how to interpret the current nuclear noise, what we think Moscow expects to achieve, how we understand "security" in the present context, and how we might respond. Instead of re-validating the efficacy of nuclear threats, Russia's nuclear actions and Western responses point to the central importance of dialogue for crisis management in the short term and conflict resolution over the longer term. This speaks to a different set of priorities that include preventing the collapse of the Ukrainian economy, providing humanitarian and reconstruction support for Ukraine, and reaching common understandings on nuclear and wider military restraint, all of which will require some degree of Russian cooperation.[75] More broadly, it requires prioritising investment in "cooperative security efforts aimed at enhancing stability, mutual security and predictability through dialogue, reciprocity, transparency and arms limitations" that have eroded over the past decade.[76] There is certainly a role for ensuring a conventional capacity to rapidly push back against Russian paramilitary or proxy interventions in NATO allies but whilst pushing hard on dialogue on Russian security concerns. There seems to be some appreciation of the counterproductive effects of reciprocating Russia's nuclear messaging that lend Russian threats undue credence and political weight and reinforce Russian enemy images. Instead

the response has been more low key; one of political reassurance to worried allies based on established commitments and enhanced responsiveness.

From this standpoint it is not clear what constructive role, if any, UK nuclear deterrent threats have to play, in particular given the very real challenges and risks involved as detailed in the first part of the chapter. Priority should be placed on firmly downplaying and delegitimising any role for nuclear weapons in managing the current confrontation irrespective of Russia's nuclear activities. It is not necessary or in the United Kingdom's, NATO's, or the wider "West's" interests to embed relations with Russia in a permanently renuclearised confrontation. As Egon Bahr and Gotz Neuneck argued in 2015: [11.47]

> It is neither intelligent, nor in European interests, to raise again dramatically the threat of nuclear war. As Ronald Reagan recognised, a nuclear war "cannot be won and must never be fought". These weapons' effects are so overwhelming and catastrophic that any concept of using them in a "limited" way is completely disconnected from reality.[77] [11.48]

CONCLUSION [11.49]

This chapter has challenged the nuclear absolutism in UK nuclear weapons narratives. It has highlighted the inescapable contingency and risk of practicing nuclear deterrence. It argues that the degree of nuclear weapons-induced stability claimed by deterrence advocates is illusory and constitutes a different form of nuclear utopianism; namely, the belief that a stable nuclear order can be maintained indefinitely by a handful of states that claim unique, essential, and infallible security benefits from nuclear weapons.[78] It challenges arguments, both explicit and implicit, that nuclear deterrence can operate impeccably for all time and forever stabilise relations between nuclear-armed states such that the potential for global nuclear relations to spiral into nuclear conflict is eternally held in check. This is the real fantasy, one highlighted by profound concerns that nuclear dangers are escalating between Russia and NATO.[79] [11.50]

Furthermore, the chapter has highlighted the very limited and potentially counterproductive role UK nuclear weapons have to play in responding to and managing the current crisis with Russia over Ukraine. Clearly one can accept these contingencies, risks, and limited roles in geopolitical crises and still firmly support retention of nuclear weapons, but the strategic case becomes very thin. Instead, it is legitimate and necessary to ask whether the deeply contested benefits of nuclear weapons are worth the risk. Most countries judge they are not. Most countries concur that nuclear weapons are a source of risk, rather than some form of insurance *against* security risks. Most countries strongly advocate concrete steps towards nuclear disarma- [11.51]

ment. Such efforts have been consistently hampered by nuclear-armed states operating in a security paradigm that is seemingly dependent on their indefinite retention of nuclear weapons.[80] This security paradigm is being reproduced by Russian and to a lesser extent by NATO nuclear activities.

[11.52] The chapter argues that the lack of any role for UK nuclear weapons is because the current crisis is symptomatic of a broader set of challenges of political and economic development and transition in post-Soviet states, including Russia. It is grappling with this set of challenges that will shape our security. This encompasses a set of difficult and long-term issues that can often get relegated because they are rooted in human security and development rather than military state security and Western conceptions of interstate order. Preventing the collapse of the Ukrainian economy and aiding postwar reconstruction, reconciliation, and demilitarisation are clear but difficult long-term security priorities that will invariably require Russian involvement and cooperation. Moreover, this type of crisis is not new, and they raise a broader set of questions about the relationship between Russian aspirations and interests and realizing a sustainable set of European security understandings and practices. Like it or not, it is clear that Russia is integral to a stable European security environment and that it is counterproductive to dismiss its security concerns as wholly illegitimate. The question, then, is one of *how*: How can we work collectively with what may well remain a semiauthoritarian Russia over the next decade or two to build a mutually acceptable European security environment, even accepting that Russian political practices are at odds with European liberalism? What do we think that might look like over that time period building on Cold War and post–Cold War successes and failures? This is speaking to a set of intrinsic problems that entangle regional interstate order and human security needs and aspirations.

[11.53] Rather than investing in nuclear weapons and perpetuating a dangerous nuclear security paradigm, enlightened self-interest recognises the imperatives of cooperative security to address regional and global security challenges and long-term diplomatic investment in the arduous tasks of inter- and intrastate conflict resolution.

[11.54] NOTES

[11n1] 1. Nick Ritchie, "Valuing and Devaluing Nuclear Weapons," *Contemporary Security Policy* 34, no. 1 (2013): 146–73.

[11n2] 2. This reflects what Falk and Lifton labeled "nuclearism". R. Falk, and R. Lifton, *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case against Nuclearism* (New York: Basic Books, 1982).

[11n3] 3. Daniel Deudney, *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).

[11n4] 4. S. Flank, "Exploding the Black Box: The Historical Sociology of Nuclear Proliferation", *Security Studies* 3, no. 2 (1993): 259.

5. George Osborne, "A Conversation with George Osborne", Council on Foreign Relations, New York, December 7, 2015, http://www.cfr.org/united-kingdom/conversation-george-osborne/p37302. [11n5]
6. Ministry of Defence & Foreign & Commonwealth Office, *The Future of the United Kingdom's Nuclear Deterrent*, Cm 6994 (London: HMSO. 2006), 6. [11n6]
7. Nick Witney recognised early in the post–Cold War era a process of "substituting for specific deterrent threat of old threats the more generalised concept of insurance against new risks", Witney, *The British Nuclear Deterrent After the Cold War* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1995), 109. [11n7]
8. MoD and FCO, *The Future of the United Kingdom's Nuclear Deterrent*, 5. [11n8]
9. Ibid., 18. [11n9]
10. House of Commons (2011), *Official Report*, 18 May, Col. 338. [11n10]
11. House of Commons (2015), *Official Report*, 23 November, Col. 1079. [11n11]
12. MoD and FCO, *The Future of the United Kingdom's Nuclear Deterrent*, 5 and 18. [11n12]
13. Des Browne, "The United Kingdom's Nuclear Deterrent in the 21st Century", speech at King's College London, January 25, 2007. [11n13]
14. Anthony Burke, "Nuclear Reason: At the Limits of Strategy", *International Relations* 23, no. 4 (2009): 507. [11n14]
15. J. Forsyth, B. Chance, & G. Saltzman, "Remembrance of Things Past: The Enduring Value of Nuclear Weapons", *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (2010): 75. [11n15]
16. Scott Sagan, "The Commitment Trap", *International Security* 24, no. 4 (2000): 97–98. Robert Jervis, "The Confrontation between Iraq and the US: Implications for the Theory and Practice of Deterrence", *European Journal of International Relations* 9, no. 2 (2003): 322–23; A. George, & Richard Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), chapter 17. [11n16]
17. See Wyn Bowen, "Deterrence and Asymmetry: Non-State Actors and Mass Casualty Terrorism", in *Deterrence and the New Global Security Environment*, eds. Ian Kenyon & Ian Simpson (London: Routledge, 2006), 50–51; Ken Booth, *Strategy and Ethnocentrism* (London: Croom Helm, 1979). [11n17]
18. E. Adler, "Complex Deterrence in the Asymmetric-Warfare Era", in *Complex Deterrence: Strategy in the Global Age*, eds. T. V. Paul, Patrick Morgan, & James Wirtz, 88–90 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009). [11n18]
19. James Lebovic, *Deterring International Terrorism and Rogue States* (London: Routledge, 2007), 4. [11n19]
20. DFI International, *Non-Nuclear Strategic Deterrence of State and Non-State Adversaries* (Washington, DC: Defense Threat Reduction Agency, 2001), 21; R. Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976). [11n20]
21. See Scott Sagan, *The Limits of Safety: Organizations, Accidents, and Nuclear Weapons* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); Peter Pry, *War Scare: Russia and America and the Nuclear Brink* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1999); Richard Ned Lebow & J. Stein, *We All Lost the Cold War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994). [11n21]
22. G. Butler, "The Risks of Nuclear Deterrence: From Superpowers to Rogue Leaders", speech to the National Press Club, Washington, DC, February 2. [11n22]
23. Michael Howard, "Military Power and International Order", *International Affairs* 40, no. 3 (1964): 402–3. [11n23]
24. John Mueller, "The Essential Irrelevance of Nuclear Weapons", *International Security* 13, no. 2 (1988): 66. [11n24]
25. M. MccGwire, "Is There a Future for Nuclear Weapons"? *International Affairs* 70, no. 2 (1994): 218. [11n25]
26. George Kennan, "American Policy toward Russia on the Eve of the 1984 Presidential Election", in G. Kennan, *At a Century's Ending: Reflections 1982–1995* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996), 105. Cited in R. Green, *The Naked Nuclear Emperor* (Christchurch, New Zealand: The Disarmament and Security Centre, 2000), 38. [11n26]
27. T. Sechser, & M. Furhmann. "Crisis Bargaining and Nuclear Blackmail", *International Organization* 67, no. 1 (2013): 1. [11n27]

[11n28] 28. J. Kugler, "Terror without Deterrence", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28, no. 3 (1984): 479–82.

[11n29] 29. Jeremy Stocker, "The United Kingdom and Nuclear Deterrence", Adelphi Paper 386 (London, Routledge for IISS, 2007), 34.

[11n30] 30. Robin Cook, "Worse Than Irrelevant"? *The Guardian*, July 29, 2005, http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2005/jul/29/labour.politicalcolumnists.

[11n31] 31. H. Nash, "The Bureaucratization of Homicide", in E. P. Thompson & D. Smith (eds.), *Protest and Survive*, 62–74 (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1980).

[11n32] 32. Anthony Burke, "Nuclear Reason: At the Limits of Strategy", *International Relations* 23, no. 4 (2009): 506–29.

[11n33] 33. Alex Wellerstein, "The Heart of Deterrence", *Nuclearsecrecy blog*, September 19, 2012, http://blog.nuclearsecrecy.com/2012/09/19/the-heart-of-deterrence/.

[11n34] 34. DFI International/SPARTA, Inc., *US Coercion in a World of Proliferating and Varied WMD Capabilities: Final Report for the Project on Deterrence and Cooperation in a Multi-Tiered Nuclear World* (Washington, DC: Defence Threat Reduction Agency, 2001), 21.

[11n35] 35. See, for example, M. MccGwire, "Deterrence: The Problem not the Solution", *International Affairs* 62, no. 1 (1986): 55–70; and Ward Wilson, "The Winning Weapon? Rethinking Nuclear Weapons in Light of Hiroshima", *International Security* 31, no. 4 (2007): 162–79.

[11n36] 36. Michael Krepon, "Can Deterrence Ever Be Stable"? *Survival* 57, no. 3 (2015): 111–32.

[11n37] 37. The most recent being Eric Schlosser, *Command and Control: Nuclear Weapons, the Damascus Accident, and the Illusion of Control* (New York: Penguin Books, 2013).

[11n38] 38. C. Lundgren, "What Are the Odds? Assessing the Probability of a Nuclear War", *The Nonproliferation Review* 20, no. 2 (2013): 362.

[11n39] 39. Ibid., 371 and 370.

[11n40] 40. M. Wallace, B. Crissey, & L. Sennott, "Accidental Nuclear War: A Risk Assessment", *Journal of Peace Research* 23, no. 9 (1986): 23.

[11n41] 41. Ibid., 373. For analysis of Cold War nuclear mishaps see A. Phillips, "20 Mishaps That Might Have Started Accidental Nuclear War", Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, January 1998, http://nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/nuclear-weapons/issues/accidents/20-mishaps-maybe-caused-nuclear-war.htm; Scott Sagan, *The Limits of Safety*; and Shaun Gregory, *The Hidden Costs of Deterrence: Nuclear Weapons Accidents* (London: Brassey's, 1990).

[11n42] 42. I. Helfand, "Nuclear Famine: Two Billion People at Risk", Second ed., International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and Physicians for Social Responsibility (2013); A. Robock, and O. Toon, "Local Nuclear War: Global Suffering", *Scientific American* 302 (January 2010): 74–81.

[11n43] 43. MoD and FCO, *The Future of the United Kingdom's Nuclear Deterrent*, 13: "Nuclear deterrent is only relevant to strategic threats that emanate directly from a state with significant military capabilities and unpredictable intent that is capable of being deterred from, and then desisting from, carrying out that threat against the UK." Russia remains the central focus.

[11n44] 44. Nick Witney, *The British Nuclear Deterrent After the Cold War* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1995), 108.

[11n45] 45. For example, in 2002 the Labour government's 2002 public consultation paper on missile defence said the threat of a Russian nuclear strike was "entirely remote" but "Russia maintains a substantial nuclear arsenal, to which our own strategic deterrent continues to provide an important counter-poise". Ministry of Defence, *Missile Defence: A Public Discussion Paper* (London: Ministry of Defence, 2002), 28.

[11n46] 46. D. Trenin, "Russia's Spheres of *Interest*, not *Influence*", *Washington Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (2009): 12.

[11n47] 47. Vladimir Putin, "Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy", February 10, 2007.

[11n48] 48. On security dilemmas and their mitigation see K. Booth & N.Wheeler, *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan). On NATO and Russia see M. Kramer, "Russia, the Baltic Region, and the Challenge for NATO", PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo No. 267 (July 2013).

[11n49] 49. See G. Gusterson, "Nuclear Weapons and the Other in the Western Imagination", *Cultural Anthropology* 14, no. 1 (1999): 111–43 for an analysis of nuclear "othering".

50. Task Force on Cooperation in Greater Europe, "Avoiding War in Europe: How to Reduce the Risk of a Military Encounter between Russia and NATO", *European Leadership Network*, August 2015. [11n50]

51. NATO, "Wales Summit Declaration", September 5, 2014, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112964.htm. [11n51]

52. Sanctions have been applied by the United States, European Union, Japan, Australia, Canada, and other non-EU European countries including Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, and Moldova. [11n52]

53. E. MacAskill, "NATO to Review Nuclear Weapons Policy as Attitude towards Russia Hardens", *The Guardian*, June 24, 2015; H. Kristensen, "Adjusting NATO's Nuclear Posture", *FAS Strategic Security blog*, December 7, 2015, available at https://fas.org/blogs/security/2015/12/poland/. [11n53]

54. K. Kroenig, "Facing Reality: Getting NATO Ready for a New Cold War", *Survival* 57, no. 1 (2015); J. Durkalec, "Nuclear-Backed 'Little Green Men': Nuclear Messaging in the Ukraine Crisis", Polish Institute of International Affairs, July 2015; C. Murdock et al., "Project Atom: A Competitive Strategies Approach to Defining U.S. Nuclear Strategy and Posture for 2025–2050", *Center for Strategic and International Studies*, Washington, DC, May 2015. See also L. Kulesa, "NATO at the Crossroads—Again", *ELN Policy Brief*, European Leadership Network, August 2014. [11n54]

55. Nikolai Sokov, "The 'Return' of Nuclear Weapons", *OpenDemocracy*, November 28, 2014, https://www.opendemocracy.net/od-russia/nikolai-sokov/'return'-of-nuclear-weapons. [11n55]

56. Ian Kearns, L. Kulesa, & Tom Frear, "Russia-West Dangerous Brinkmanship Continues", *European Leadership Network*, March 12, 2015, http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/russia--west-dangerous-brinkmanship-continues-_2529.html. [11n56]

57. M. Day, "Russia 'Simulates' Nuclear Attack on Poland", *Daily Telegraph*, November 1, 2009. The joint Russia-Belarus Zapad ("West") exercise simulated repulsion of a NATO attack on Belarus. [11n57]

58. (Geneva: UNIDIR,Research Group,, P.abelled sia. It is this set of challenges security paradigm, ng to and managing the current Z. Keck, "Russia's Military Begins Massive Nuclear War Drill", *The Diplomat*, March 29, 2014. Available athttp://thediplomat.com/2014/03/russias-military-begins-massive-nuclear-war-drill/. [11n58]

59. Reuters, "Russia Says Has Right to Deploy Nuclear Weapons in Crimea: Report", March 11, 2015,http://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-crimea-nuclear-idUSKBN0M710N20150311. [11n59]

60. R. Milne, "Russia Delivers Nuclear Warning to Denmark", *Financial Times*, March 22, 2015. [11n60]

61. M. Laurinavičius, "Opinion: Russia's Nuclear Blackmail and New Threats of Covert Diplomacy", *The Lithuania Tribune*, April 9, 2015,http://en.delfi.lt/opinion/opinion-russias-nuclear-blackmail-and-new-threats-of-covert-diplomacy.d?id=67654958. [11n61]

62. Richard Norton-Taylor, "Ukraine Boosts Case for Nuclear Weapons, Say Trident Supporters", *The Guardian*, March 20, 2014. [11n62]

63. A. Croft, "UK Concerned over 'Threatening' Russian Nuclear Strategy", *Reuters*, February 6, 2015, available at http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-ukraine-crisis-fallon-idUKKBN0LA1PF20150206; M. Becker, "Nuclear Specter Returns: 'Threat of War Is Higher Than in Cold War'", *Der Speigel*, February 13, 2015, http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/munich-conference-warns-of-greater-threat-of-nuclear-conflict-a-1018357.html. [11n63]

64. See, for example, B. Stewart, *Official Report*, Hansard, 25 February 2015, Col. 239, Vol. 593. [11n64]

65. See M. Rublee, "Fantasy Counterfactual: A Nuclear-Armed Ukraine", *Survival* 57, no. 2 (2015): 145–56. [11n65]

66. For detailed analysis see Nick Ritchie, *A Nuclear Weapons-Free World? Trident, Britain and the Challenges Ahead* (Basingstoke, Palgrave: 2013). [11n66]

67. M. Smith, "Britain: Balancing 'Instinctive Atlanticism'", *Contemporary Security Policy* 26, no. 3 (2005): 448. [11n67]

68. See Franklin Miller, "The Future of the United Kingdom's Nuclear Deterrent", *RUSI Journal* 155, no. 2 (2010): 39 for an example. [11n68]

[11n69] 69. MoD and FCO, *The Future of the United Kingdom's Nuclear Deterrent*, 18.

[11n70] 70. See Neil Cooper, "Putting Disarmament Back in the Frame", *Review of International Studies* 32, no. 2 (2006): 370–74.

[11n71] 71. J. Lewis, "Nuclear Disarmament versus Peace in the 21st Century", First Defence, London, 2005.

[11n72] 72. L. Shevtsova, "The Putin Doctrine: Myth, Provocation, Blackmail, or the Real Deal"? *The American Interest*, April 14, 2014,http://www.the-american-interest.com/articles/2014/04/14/the-putin-doctrine-myth-provocation-blackmail-or-the-real-deal/.

[11n73] 73. A. Golts, "Russia's Nuclear Euphoria Ignores Reality", *The Moscow Times*, October 6, 2014,http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/russia-s-nuclear-euphoria-ignores-reality/508499.html.

[11n74] 74. A. Arbatov, "Commentary: Protecting Nuclear Sanity", *Defense News*, June 15, 2015, http://www.defensenews.com/story/defense/commentary/2015/06/15/commentary-protecting-nuclear-sanity/71262990/.

[11n75] 75. I. Kearns, P. Hilde, & L. Kulesa, "Managing Difference and Redefining Common Interests with Russia: A European Perspective", *Policy Brief, European Leadership Network*, March 2015.

[11n76] 76. E. Bahr, & G. Neuneck, "Forum: NATO and Russia", *Survival* 57, no. 2 (2015): 133.

[11n77] 77. Ibid., 130.

[11n78] 78. Ken Booth, "Debating the Future of Trident: Who Are the Real Realists"? in *The Future of Britain's Nuclear Weapons: Experts Reframe the Debate*, eds. Ken Booth and Frank Barnaby (Oxford, Oxford Research Group, 2006).

[11n79] 79. See former US Defense Secretary William Perry, "The Risk of Nuclear Catastrophe Is Greater Today Than During the Cold War", *Huffington Post*, January 20, 2016, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/william-jperry/nuclear-catastrophe-risk_b_9019558.html.

[11n80] 80. See Nick Ritchie, "Legitimising and Delegitimising Nuclear Weapons", in *Viewing Nuclear Weapons through a Humanitarian Lens*, John Borrie & T. Caughley (eds.) (Geneva: UNIDIR, 2013).